



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/645,999	08/21/2003	Mark McDowell	LEW 17, 484-1	8671
26311	7590	04/05/2005	EXAMINER	
NASA GLENN RESEARCH CENTER 21000 BROOKPARK ROAD OFFICE OF CHIEF COUNSEL; MAIL STOP 500-118 CLEVELAND, OH 44135			PRITCHETT, JOSHUA L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2872	

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/645,999	MCDOWELL, MARK	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Joshua L. Pritchett	2872	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 January 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 27-32 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 and 33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 August 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/03</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to Election filed January 5, 2005. Applicant elected claims 24 and 25 without traverse. The examiner assumes that the applicant intended to elect claims 24-26 because the claims were grouped together in the previous office action. Claims 1-26 and 33 will be examined; the remaining claims are withdrawn from consideration.

Election/Restrictions

Claims 27-32 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on January 5, 2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3-10, 12-18 and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Greenwald (US 6,330,106).

Regarding claims 1, 10 and 18, Greenwald discloses an imaging system comprising a video microscope (Fig. 1) comprising a holder (10) for specimens (34) and a camera located so as to be focused on the holder (col. 6 lines 1-13), a light source operatively connected to the video microscope (col. 4 lines 44-45), a robotic system operatively connected to and for positioning the video microscope (col. 6 lines 15-25), and a computer operatively connected to both the camera and the robotic system (Fig. 1; col. 6 lines 4-9) the computer having operating programs comprising routines for providing machine vision techniques for scanning (col. 3 lines 20-22) and detecting (col. 5 lines 9-11) features of the specimen. Greenwald discloses saving images collected from viewing the specimen (col. 6 lines 5-10) along with the location of the images (col. 6 lines 5-10). The examiner considers saving the image and the location of the image to be a system of tracking features of the specimen.

Regarding claims 3, 12 and 20, Greenwald discloses the camera has charge-coupled devices comprising its head and which are operatively connected to the computer by an image acquisition board (col. 6 lines 2-5).

Regarding claims 4, 13 and 22, Greenwald discloses the operating programs further comprise routines for controlling the robotics system, which, in turn, controls positioning of the video microscope, which, in turn, controls the positioning of the camera (Fig. 1; col. 6 lines 1-14).

Regarding claims 5, 14 and 23, Greenwald discloses the operating programs further comprise algorithms which operatively cooperative with the routines for scanning, identifying, detecting and tracking selected characteristics and features of the specimen (col. 5 lines 9-11;

Art Unit: 2872

col. 6 lines 5-10). The storage of images and locations in the memory would require the use of algorithms.

Regarding claims 6 and 15, Greenwald discloses the operating program further comprises neural network, routines which operative control the robotic system (Fig. 1).

Regarding claims 7, 16 and 21, Greenwald discloses the robotic system provides three-dimensional positioning of the video microscope, which, in turn, provides three-dimensional positioning of the specimen held in the holder (Fig. 2).

Regarding claims 8 and 17, Greenwald discloses the robotic system comprising a platform (12) for holding and orienting the video microscope (Figs. 1 and 2).

Regarding claim 9, Greenwald discloses the computer comprises a display terminal (60; Fig. 1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 11 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greenwald in view of Knebel (US 6,388,807).

Greenwald teaches the invention as claimed but lacks reference to a fiber optic light source. Greenwald teaches the use of a laser light source in a confocal scanning microscope. Knebel teaches the use of an optical fiber associated with a laser light source for use in a confocal scanning microscope (col. 3 lines 1-5). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the Greenwald invention include a fiber optic light source as taught by Knebel for the purpose of expanding the functionality of the Greenwald microscope to include multiple light sources having different wavelengths.

Claims 24-26 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greenwald in view of Abdel-Fattah (US 2004/0218798).

Greenwald teaches the invention as claimed but lacks reference to the use of colloid hard spheres. Abdel-Fattah teaches placing a colloid hard sphere specimen having a solid/liquid interface in the holder (abstract), causing the video microscope to generate an electronic image of the colloid specimen (Fig. 8), examining the electronic image to determine the origin size of pixels representing particles (para. 0088), examining the frame of the electronic image to determine if the solid/liquid interface has horizontal or vertical crystal growth (para. 0192), generating a series of frames of the electronic images (Fig. 8), performing averaging of the frames to visually separate solid and liquid portions of the electronic image (abstract), examining the electronic image to identify the solid and liquid portions of the specimen (Fig. 8) and storing the data in a data base associated with the colloid specimen (Fig. 8). Abdel-Fattah lacks specific reference to the use of dilation and threshold algorithms, however Abdel-Fattah does teach that

Art Unit: 2872

calculations are performed on the saved electronic images (Fig. 8). The type of calculations performed would depend on the preference of the operator and one of ordinary skill in the art would readily recognize the need to perform both dilation and threshold calculations on the saved images. Greenwald further lacks reference to superimposing other data onto the saved image. It is extremely well known in the art to use superimposition to display relevant data on a image of a video microscope for the purpose of quicker and easier viewing and evaluation of the observed image. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the Greenwald invention include hard colloid spheres as a specimen and the associated calculations as taught by Abdel-Fattah for the purpose of determining the composition of an emulsion sample. It would also have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the Greenwald invention include superimposition of calculated data onto the observed image as is known in the art for the purpose of easy evaluation of the observed image.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Kapitza (US 6,198,573) teaches the use of a computer to support a video microscope.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua L. Pritchett whose telephone number is 571-272-2318.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:00 - 3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Drew A. Dunn can be reached on 571-272-2312. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JLP 


DREW A. DUNN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER